



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/051,545  | 01/18/2002  | Yanfeng Lu           | 1565.005US1         | 9644             |
| 21186   | 7590        | 08/09/2006           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.<br>P.O. BOX 2938<br>MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402 |             |                      | LIN, WEN TAI        |                  |
|   |             | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER        |                  |
|   |             | 2154                 |                     |                  |

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| <b><i>Office Action Summary</i></b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
|                                     | 10/051,545             | LU, YANFENG         |
| <b>Examiner</b>                     | <b>Art Unit</b>        |                     |
| Wen-Tai Lin                         | 2154                   |                     |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2006.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## **Disposition of Claims**

4)  Claim(s) 1-9 and 16-23 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-9 and 16-23 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All    b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date .

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_ .

5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-9 and 16-23 are presented for examination.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, USC code not included in this action can be found in the prior Office Action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. Claims 1-9 and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lakritz [U.S. Pat. No. 6623529].
4. As to claim 1, Lakritz teaches the invention as claimed including: a method of providing concurrent access to data on cross-computing environments, comprising:
  - receiving a first request for the data from a first computing environment;
  - receiving a second request for the data from a second computing environment,
  - wherein the second computing environment is different from the first computing environment [Abstract; col.18, lines 61-63];
  - identifying a first message file [i.e., a document template from the master site] to service the requests; and
  - concurrently providing access to the first message file to both the first computing environment and the second computing environment in order to load the data as directed by the

first request from the first computing environment and the second request from the second computing environment, wherein the first message file is for dynamically rendering and translating the data into a desired language associated with the first and second requests and wherein at least a portion of the message file is dynamically resolved in response to the first computing environment, and wherein the portion is different from another portion that is dynamically resolved from the message file in response to the second computing environment and wherein the desired language is related to a language used in a particular country having a particular dialect [col.6, line 50 – col.7 line 11; col.18, lines 42 – 67].

5. As to claims 2-4, Lakritz further teaches loading the first message file into a memory or a data store before providing the message file to the requests [note that it is inherent to load a template file originally stored in a disk to a main memory prior to any associated operation can be performed on the template], wherein the first message file is identified with a first language associated with the requests [e.g., col.4, lines 35-45].

6. As to claim 5, Lakritz further teaches that in providing the first message file, the first message file is represented in a generic file format [col.6, lines 50-57].

7. As to claim 6, Lakritz further teaches that that a visitor who request a document to be presented in a different language, a different document template (i.e., a template having the visitor's preferred language resolved) results. This serves as a second message file that is concurrently served to visitors using a first message file.

8. As to claims 7-9 and 16-21, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1 and 6, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1- 6 above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. Claims 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz [U.S. Pat. No. 6623529], as applied to claims 1-9 and 16-21 above, further in view of Official Notice .

10. As to claim 22, Lakritz does not specifically teach that the system further comprises a single application programming interface library providing an interface between the set of language manager executable instructions and the requests from the computing environments.

However, Official Notice is taken that using API in various application environment is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an API directly accessible by the operating system of Lakritz's computer for providing the interface as claimed because the use of API greatly simplifies the programming/development effort [note that Lakritz also uses API to interface various translation resources – see col.11 lines 29-35].

11. As to claim 23, Lakritz does not specifically teach that the requests and the message files are represented in an extensible markup language format.

However, Official Notice is taken that using XML for web page presentation is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use XML for the requests and the message files are represented in an extensible markup language format in Lakritz's system because Lakritz's message file may include a plurality of message sets, each associated with a natural language, and it would facilitate the extraction of any desired message set from the file if the latter is tagged in XML format.

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Parish [U.S. Pat. No. 6964014], who teaches a method for localizing web pages by reading/updating a computer file containing HTML tags and scripts for identifying character strings located within the tags and scripts.

### ***Conclusion***

**Examiner note:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially

teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the contest of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen-Tai Lin whose telephone number is (571)272-3969. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-5:00) .

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(571)273-8300 for official communications; and

(571)273-3969 for status inquires draft communication.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Wen-Tai Lin

August 4, 2006

  
8/4/06